

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action for the above-identified application mailed November 4, 2003.

In the Office Action, it was stated that the claims submitted in the Amendment filed August 14, 2003 was non-responsive.

In a telephone interview with the Examiner on November 18, 2003, it was acknowledged that Claims 32-41 are claims that are responsive to the outstanding amendment and that they would be examined. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of willingness to review these claims.

Under cover of this Response, minor editorial changes were made to Claim 32. This change does not modify the definition of the screening device to which this claim is directed.

Claims 42-61 have now been cancelled. No new claims are added.

It is submitted that this application is now in condition in which it substantive review should continue.

It is submitted that, for the reasons set forth in the amendment filed August 14, 2003, Claims 32 and the companion dependent claims are directed to an invention that is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Goldenberg  
David S. Goldenberg

DSG\pcq

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL  
& TANIS, P.C.  
2026 Rambling Road  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1631  
Phone: (269) 381-1156  
Fax: (269) 381-5465

Dale H. Thiel	Reg. No. 24	323
David G. Boutell	Reg. No. 25	072
Ronald J. Tanis	Reg. No. 22	724
Terryence F. Chapman	Reg. No. 32	549
Mark L. Maki	Reg. No. 36	589
David S. Goldenberg	Reg. No. 31	257
Liane L. Churney	Reg. No. 40	694
Brian R. Tumm	Reg. No. 36	328
Robert J. Sayfie	Reg. No. 37	714
Steven R. Thiel	Reg. No. 53	685
Sidney B. Williams, Jr.	Reg. No. 24	949

Encl: Postal Card  
136.0703